

ESTTA Tracking number: **ESTTA370223**

Filing date: **09/25/2010**

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE TRADEMARK TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Proceeding	91190169
Party	Defendant Susino USA, LLC
Correspondence Address	Todd Nadrich Susino USA, Ltd. PO BOX 1013 LOXAHATCHEE, FL 33470-1013 UNITED STATES tnadrich@stsource.com
Submission	Other Motions/Papers
Filer's Name	Todd Nadrich
Filer's e-mail	tnadrich@stsource.com
Signature	/Todd Nadrich/
Date	09/25/2010
Attachments	09-2010 objection motion to strike exhibits w attahced.pdf (18 pages)(528265 bytes)

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE BEFORE THE TRADEMARK
TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

In The Matter of App. Ser. No. 77/355,544)	
)	
)	
SUSINO UMBRELLA CO., LTD.)	
)	
Opposer,)	
)	
v.)	Opposition No. 91190169
)	
SUSINO USA, LLC)	
)	
Applicant,)	

**APPLICANTS OBJECTION AND MOTION TO STRIKE EXHIBITS ATTACHED TO
OPPOSERS' BRIEF**

Applicant Susino USA files this Objection and Motion to Strike exhibits attached to Opposers' brief in support of the motion for relief from judgment. Pursuant to TBMP § 539 - Motion to strike brief on case, (§ 5) "Evidentiary material attached to a brief on the case can be given no consideration unless it was properly made of record during the testimony period of the offering party. If evidentiary material not of record is attached to a brief on the case, an adverse party may object thereto by motion to strike or otherwise." ¹

- 1) On August 29, 2009, Opposer sent Applicant its initial disclosure. (Exhibit 1)²
- 2) On December 10, 2009, the Board issued an order resetting dates. The order set the date for close of discovery to be on May 11, 2010.(Exhibit 2)³

¹ See, for example, Binney & Smith Inc. v. Magic Marker Industries, Inc., 222 USPQ 1003, 1009 n.18 (TTAB 1984) (copy of decision by Canadian Opposition Board attached to brief given no consideration); and Plus Products v. Physicians Formula Cosmetics, Inc., 198 USPQ 111, 112 n.3 (TTAB 1978) (applicant's exhibits attached to its brief cannot be considered). See also Angelica Corp. v. Collins & Aikman Corp., 192 USPQ 387 (TTAB 1976); L. Leichner (London) Ltd. v. Robbins, supra; Tektronix, Inc. v. Daktronics, Inc., 187 USPQ 588 (TTAB 1975), aff'd, 534 F.2d 915, 189 USPQ 693 (CCPA 1976); and Ortho Pharmaceutical Corp. v. Hudson Pharmaceutical Corp., 178 USPQ 429 (TTAB 1973). ⁵¹⁶ See, for example, 37 CFR §§ 2.129(a)

² Opposers initial disclosures names one person only, Wang Jianzhang, English name Jorzon Wang

³ Opposer never refers to the Order. The Order was mailed to the correct address of the Opposers' representative by the TTAB.

3) On August 20, 2010, Opposer filed a motion for relief from judgment with an attached brief, a written declaration, and sixteen (16) exhibits.

4) Applicant specifically objects to Exhibits 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9, 10 and 15. Declarant Anbang Wang claims the exhibits were given to him and translated to him by Opposers' employees or agents. Opposer offers no other declarations of the persons these documents were initially intended to support the authenticity of the exhibits. Applicant is prejudiced by Opposers attempt to introduce these exhibits after the close of discovery and drawing attention away from Opposers' neglect and inaction.

5) The sole declaration attached is from a Mr. Anbang Wang. This person is not the same person named in Opposers initial disclosures. There are no other declarations attached to Opposers brief in support of.

6) Opposer has not previously made any of the exhibits as part of the record during the testimony period and did not name Mr. Anbang Wang in its initial disclosures.

WHEREFORE, Susino USA, Applicant, request this Board to strike exhibits 1 thru 10, 15 and give them no consideration since none have been properly made of record during the testimony period and give limited or no consideration to the declaration of Mr. Anbang Wang since he was never named in the initial disclosures by Opposers' former counsel.

Respectfully Submitted:

By: /s/ /Todd Nadrich/

Todd Nadrich
Susino USA, Ltd
PO Box 1013
Loxahatchee, Fl. 33470
Telephone: 954-252-3911
Fax: 954-252-3911

Certificate of Service

I hereby certified that the above and forgoing this Notice of Consent for Extension of Time by depositing a copy of same in the United States Mail and by e-mail to davidsilverman@dwt.com, first class postage prepaid, on this 24th day of September, 2010, addressed to:

David Silverman
Davis Wright Tremaine LLP
1919 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Suite 800
Washington, DC 20006-3401
Attorney for Opposers

/s/ /Todd Nadrich/

Todd Nadrich

EXHIBIT 1

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE TRADEMARK TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

In the Matter of App. Ser. No. 77/355,544)	
)	
SUSINO UMBRELLA CO., LTD.)	
)	
Opposer,)	
)	
v.)	Opposition No. 91190169
)	
SUSINO USA LLC,)	
)	
Applicant.)	

OPPOSER SUSINO UMBRELLA'S INITIAL DISCLOSURE

Opposer, Susino Umbrella Co., Ltd., ("Susino Umbrella" or "Opposer") hereby submits its Initial Disclosures under 37 C.F.R. § 2.120.

Individuals Likely to Have Discoverable Information

Based on information presently available to it and subject to its continuing investigation, and without waiving any applicable privileges or other objections, Susino Umbrella submits the following names of individuals likely to have discoverable information relevant to disputed facts alleged with particularity in the pleadings. Susino Umbrella reserves the right to supplement or amend this statement pursuant to the rules upon receipt of subsequently filed pleadings or further investigation in this case.

NAME AND ADDRESS	SUBJECT OF INFORMATION
Name: WANG JIANZHANG (English Name: JORZON WANG), SALES MANAGER ,participated in the Aug 2007 US Trade Show; Address: JINOU IND.DISTRICT, DONGSHI, JINJIANG, FUJIAN, CHINA POSTAL POSTAL CODE: 362271; Contact: 0086-595-85589898 85599006 MASTER@SUSINO.NET.CN	Selection and use of SUSINO mark and contacts with Susino USA.

Documents

Based on information presently available to it and subject to its continuing investigation, and without waiving any applicable privileges or other objections, Susino Umbrella describes the following categories of documents that are or may be relevant to the disputed facts alleged with particularity in the pleadings. Virtually all documents, data compilations and tangible things in Susino Umbrella's possession, custody or control that are or may be relevant to issues in dispute are located at Susino Umbrella's offices in Jin' ou Industrial Park Dongshi Town, Jinjiang, FJ 362271 CHINA. Copies of documents that Opposer may use to support its claims are attached.

Categories of Documents: Correspondence; Facsimiles; E-mail; Reports;
Updates; Memoranda; Charts; Notes; Minutes; Statements; Spreadsheets; Presentations;
Drawings; Forecasts; Sales Reports; Invoices; Photographs.

Respectfully submitted,
SUSINO UMBRELLA CO., LTD.

By: /s/ /Scott Q. Vidas/
One of its Attorneys

Dated: August 21, 2009

Scott Q. Vidas
VIDAS, ARRETT & STEINKRAUS, P.A.
6640 Shady Oak Drive
Suite 400
Eden Prairie, Minnesota 55344-7834
Tel. No. 952-563-3000
Facsimile No. 952-563-3001
svidas@vaslaw.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I caused a true and correct copy of the foregoing **SUSINO UMBRELLA'S INITIAL DISCLOSURE** to be served upon:

**SUSINO USA, LLC
P.O. Box 1013
Loxahatchee, Florida 33470-1013**

by placing same in an envelope, properly sealed and addressed, with postage prepaid and depositing same with the United States Postal Service on this 21st day of August, 2009.

/s/ /Scott Q. Vidas/
Scott Q. Vidas

EXHIBIT 2

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
Trademark Trial and Appeal Board
P.O. Box 1451
Alexandria, VA 22313-1451

Baxley

Mailed: December 10, 2009

Opposition No. **91190169**

Susino Umbrella Co., Ltd.

v.

Susino USA, LLC

Before Hairston, Kuhlke, and Wellington,
Administrative Trademark Judges

By the Board:

This case now comes up for consideration of: (1) applicant's motion (filed August 27, 2009) to dismiss under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6) for failure to state a claim; and (2) applicant's motion (filed September 19, 2009) to strike opposer's corrected brief in response to the motion to dismiss or, in the alternative, the exhibits to the corrected brief.¹

The Board notes initially that applicant's motion to dismiss is untimely because the motion was filed after applicant filed its answer. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6); TBMP Section 503.01 (2d ed. rev. 2004). However, because opposer did not object to such motion as untimely and

¹ Because opposer filed a corrected brief in response on September 15, 2009, the original brief that opposer filed one day earlier will receive no consideration.

responded fully to the merits thereof, the untimeliness of the motion is waived. See *Wellcome Foundation Ltd. v. Merck & Co.*, 46 USPQ2d 1478 (TTAB 1998).

In connection with the motion to dismiss, both parties have relied upon matters outside of the pleading in support of their positions. We elect to exclude those matters and decline to convert applicant's motion to one for summary judgment. See *Wellcome Foundation Ltd. v. Merck & Co.*, *supra*; TBMP Section 503.03 (2d ed. rev. 2004). Neither party's exhibits have received consideration in this decision, and applicant's motion to strike opposer's exhibits in support of its corrected brief in response is moot.

To the extent that applicant otherwise seeks to strike opposer's corrected brief in response, such motion is essentially based on an objection to the content of that brief. The Board will not strike a brief upon motion or a portion thereof based on an adversary's objection to the content thereof. Rather, the Board will consider the brief, as well as the adversary's objections thereto, and disregard any portions that are found to be improper. See TBMP Section 517. Based on the foregoing, the motion to strike opposer's corrected brief in response is denied.

Turning to the motion to dismiss under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6), such a motion is a test solely of the legal

sufficiency of a complaint. See, e.g., *Advanced Cardiovascular Systems Inc. v. SciMed Life Systems Inc.*, 988 F.2d 1157, 26 USPQ2d 1038, 1041 (Fed. Cir. 1993). To withstand a motion to dismiss under Rule 12(b)(6), a pleading need only allege such facts as would, if proved, establish that the plaintiff is entitled to the relief sought, that is, that (1) the plaintiff has standing to maintain the proceeding, and (2) a valid ground exists for denying the registration sought. See, e.g., *Lipton Industries, Inc. v. Ralston Purina Co.*, 670 F.2d 1024, 213 USPQ 185 (CCPA 1982). In determining a motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, all of opposer's well-pleaded allegations must be accepted as true, and the complaint must be construed in the light most favorable to the plaintiff. See *Ritchie v. Simpson*, 170 F.3d 1092, 50 USPQ2d 1023, 1027 (Fed. Cir. 1999).

Applicant contends that opposer failed to properly plead a claim under Trademark Act Section 2(d), 15 U.S.C. Section 1052(d), because "the facts plead[ed] in its [n]otice of [o]pposition and incorporated by reference by virtue of [applicant's involved application] support the conclusion that [applicant] and not [opposer] has priority of rights in the [involved] SUSINO mark." Applicant further contends that application Serial No. 79001855 for the SUSINO

mark ("the SUSINO application"), upon which opposer relies upon in support of its claim of standing, was filed by another entity, Jinjiang Hengshum Gingham Company ("Jinjiang"),² and was abandoned four years ago. Applicant further contends that opposer, by filing the notice of opposition, is improperly seeking to revive rights in its long-abandoned application through this proceeding. Based on the foregoing, applicant asks that the Board grant its motion to dismiss this opposition.

In response, opposer contends that its notice of opposition "fulfills the requirements set out for [o]pposition [p]leading."

Inasmuch as opposer cannot rely upon an abandoned application in support of its claims herein, the Board considers any reference to the SUSINO application to be merely informational. However, applicant's apparent belief that abandonment of the SUSINO application equals an abandonment of all rights in that mark is incorrect. Even if the SUSINO application was abandoned in 2005, such abandonment does not preclude opposer from relying upon any common law rights that it has in that mark. See *Oland's Breweries [1971] Ltd. v. Miller Brewing Co.*, 189 USPQ 481 (TTAB 1975).

² Opposer contends in paragraph 3 of the notice of opposition that Jinjiang was its previous name.

In reviewing the notice of opposition, opposer has adequately pleaded that it has a real interest in this proceeding and therefore standing to oppose by alleging in paragraph 3 of the notice of opposition that it has common law rights in the involved SUSINO mark; that applicant's claim of use of the mark is based on sales of umbrellas manufactured and marked SUSINO by opposer; and that applicant was merely a middleman that received opposer's product. See *Cunningham v. Laser Golf Corp.*, 222 F.3d 943, 55 USPQ2d 1842 (Fed. Cir. 2000); *Lipton Industries, Inc. v. Ralston Purina Co.*, *supra*. Opposer's standing is further pleaded in paragraph 9 of the notice of opposition wherein opposer alleges that, if the involved application is allowed to register, opposer, despite its prior use, would likely be prevented from obtaining a registration for the SUSINO mark on umbrellas. See *American Vitamin Products Inc. v. Dow Brands Inc.*, 22 USPQ2d 1313, 1314 (TTAB 1992); TBMP Section 309.03(b).

In addition, opposer has adequately pleaded its priority of use in paragraph 4 of the notice of opposition by alleging its use of the SUSINO mark, which it contends began prior to both the filing date of applicant's involved application and the use dates alleged therein. Opposer has adequately pleaded likelihood of confusion through the allegations set forth in paragraphs 5-8 and 10 of the notice

of opposition.³ See Trademark Act Section 2(d), 15 U.S.C. Section 1052(d); *King Candy Co. v. Eunice King's Kitchen, Inc.*, 496 F.2d 1400, 182 USPQ 108 (CCPA 1974). Based on the foregoing, applicant's motion to dismiss is denied.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, we note that opposer alleges in paragraph 5 of the notice of opposition that "the designation SUSINO for the goods identified in the [a]pplication so resembles [opposer's] nationwide common law rights in the trademark and pending application to register SUSINO as to be likely to cause confusion, mistake, or deception...." However, because opposer has identified no currently pending application that it has filed to register the SUSINO mark, we *sua sponte* strike the wording "and pending application to register" from that paragraph. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(f); TBMP Section 506.01.

After the withdrawal of its attorney on October 27, 2009, opposer stated in a November 29, 2009 submission that it intends to represent itself in this proceeding. While Patent and Trademark Rule 10.14 permits any person to represent itself, it is generally advisable for a person who is not acquainted with the technicalities of the procedural and substantive law involved in inter partes proceedings before the Board to secure the services of an attorney who

³ Whether or not opposer can prevail herein is a matter for resolution on the merits. See *Flatley v. Trump*, 11 USPQ2d 1284 (TTAB 1989).

is familiar with such matters. The Patent and Trademark Office cannot aid in the selection of an attorney.

In addition, opposer should note that Trademark Rules 2.119(a) and (b) require that every paper filed in the Patent and Trademark Office in a proceeding before the Board must be served upon the attorney for the other party, or on the party if there is no attorney, and proof of such service must be made before the paper will be considered by the Board. Consequently, copies of all papers which opposer may subsequently file in this proceeding must be accompanied by a signed statement indicating the date and manner in which such service was made, e.g., by first class mail. The statement, whether attached to or appearing on the paper when filed, will be accepted as prima facie proof of service.

Further, opposer is based in China and may not use certificate of mailing procedure on submissions mailed to the Board from China. See Trademark Rule 2.197; TBMP Section 110. Any documents that opposer files by mail from China will be considered filed on the date such documents are received at the USPTO. See Trademark Rule 2.195. Accordingly, opposer is urged to file submissions in this case electronically through the Board's Electronic System for Trademark Trials and Appeals (ESTTA) at <http://estta.uspto.gov/>.

In prosecuting this opposition, opposer should review the Trademark Rules of Practice, online at

<http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/tac/tmlaw2.pdf>, and the

Trademark Board Manual of Procedure, online at

<http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/dcom/ttab/tbmp/index.html>.

The Board expects all parties appearing before it to comply with the Trademark Rules of Practice and, where applicable, the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

Proceedings herein are resumed.⁴ Remaining dates are reset as follows.

Expert Disclosures Due	4/11/10
Discovery Closes	5/11/10
Plaintiff's Pretrial Disclosures	6/25/10
Plaintiff's 30-day Trial Period Ends	8/9/10
Defendant's Pretrial Disclosures	8/24/10
Defendant's 30-day Trial Period Ends	10/8/10
Plaintiff's Rebuttal Disclosures	10/23/10
Plaintiff's 15-day Rebuttal Period Ends	11/22/10

In each instance, a copy of the transcript of testimony together with copies of documentary exhibits, must be served on the adverse party within thirty days after completion of the taking of testimony. Trademark Rule 2.125.

Briefs shall be filed in accordance with Trademark Rules 2.128(a) and (b). An oral hearing will be set only upon request filed as provided by Trademark Rule 2.129.

⁴ Applicant filed its motion to dismiss six days after the due date for its initial disclosures. Accordingly, the Board presumes that the parties have served their disclosures. If the parties have not so served, they should do so as soon as possible.

If either of the parties or their attorneys should have a change of address, the Board should be so informed promptly.